

## **REMARKS**

### **SUMMARY OF CLAIMS**

Claims 6-8, 10-17, and 19-25 are pending and are submitted for reconsideration.

### **CLAIM OBJECTION**

The office action objected to claim 10 for having improper dependency to a cancelled claim. In reply, applicants have amended claim 10 to address this objection in a manner that is consistent with the examiner's examination of this claim.

### **ART BASED REJECTIONS**

In the office action, claims 6-8, 10-14, 17, and 19-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0020784 (hereafter "Jonker"). Claims 15, 16, 24, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over Jonker in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,069,587 to Ito (hereafter "Ito"). Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections for at least the following reasons.

**Independent claim 6** recites, *inter alia*,

...receiving a response to the multicast from at least one device in the UPnP network, wherein the response includes an indicator requesting a secure communication between the device and the control point;

**invoking by using a UPnP application programming interface (API), at the control point, a first authentication process to authenticate the device with the control point;**

...  
receiving a certificate from the device, and authenticating the device using the certificate, and

sending a certificate from the control point to the device for the device to authenticate the control point.

None of these recited features is disclosed or suggested by Jonker for at least the following reasons.

Specifically, Jonker relates to a method and system for secure *content* distribution among devices in a network. See paragraph [0001] of Jonker. More specifically, the cited portions in the office action relate to a conditional access system

for content which is typically known as Digital Rights Management (DRM) systems. To accomplish a more secure DRM, Jonker discloses a Device Architecture in which Authorized Domains (ADs) are set up. An Authorized Domain Manager (ADM) participates in the check in of other devices and administers the AD. See, for example, paragraphs [0053] and [0059] of Jonker. A device manager manages all the security objects while a rights manager manages transfer rights. See paragraphs [0073] and [0076-0079] of Jonker.

However, none of this disclosure has anything to do with the claimed secure method of adding of a device to a UPnP network by **invoking by using a UPnP application programming interface (API), at the control point, a first authentication process to authenticate the device with the control point.** See, for example, figure 5 and its description in the present application which discloses that the secure channel is requested and implemented as part of adding a device to a UPnP network through a protocol stack invoked using a UPnP API. There is no disclosure of this recited feature in Jonker.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference" *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, (Fed. Cir. 1989). See MPEP §2131. Therefore, in order for a reference to be utilized as an anticipatory reference under the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 102, the reference must disclose each and every claimed element. This is certainly not the case here, and thus the Sec. 102 rejection as to independent claim 6 must be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the deficiencies of Jonker are not cured by any of the other applied references. Specifically, Ito relates to a permission state for connections being timed out so that connection can only be made for a timed period to prevent unauthorized access and does not cure above-identified deficiencies of Jonker. Therefore, independent claim 6 is patentable over the applied art.

**Independent claim 17** recites, *inter alia*, a method of adding a control point to a UPnP network, comprising transmitting a search request multicast from the control point to a predetermined network address, receiving a response to the multicast from at least one device in the UPnP network, wherein the response includes an indicator requesting a secure communication between the device and the control point; and **invoking by using a UPnP application programming interface (API), at the control point, a first authentication process** to authenticate the device with the control point. As discussed above with respect to independent claim 6, the features highlighted above are not disclosed by either Jonker or Ito or their reasonable combination for the reasons discussed in the context of similar features recited in independent claim 6. Accordingly, independent claim 17 is also believed to be patentable over the disclosure of Henry and Ito.

## **DEPENDENT CLAIMS**

The dependent claims are deemed to be patentable at least based on their dependence from allowable independent claims. In addition, they recite patentable subject matter when considered as a whole.

Specifically, claims 11-13 and 19-22 recite features in the process of the control point authenticating itself to the UPnP device. Likewise, claims 15-16 and 24-25 recite a second authentication process that transmits PIN/password from a UPnP control point to a UPnP device. None of the applied references disclose any of these features when considered as a whole. Accordingly, these recited features provide additional reasons for the patentability of these claims.

## **CONCLUSION**

Accordingly, applicant submits that the application is now in condition for allowance and an indication of the same is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that the application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

*If this Amendment is not considered timely filed and if a request for an extension of time is otherwise absent, Applicant hereby requests any necessary extension of time. If there is a fee occasioned by this Response, including an extension fee that is not covered by an enclosed check please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-0463.*

Respectfully Submitted,  
Microsoft Corporation

Dated: September 18, 2008  
Microsoft Corporation  
One Microsoft Way  
Redmond, WA 98052

By: /Aaron C. Chatterjee/  
Aaron C. Chatterjee  
Reg. No. 41,398  
(425) 706-7453

### **CERTIFICATE OF MAILING OR TRANSMISSION** **(Under 37 CFR § 1.8(a)) or ELECTRONIC FILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically deposited with the USPTO via EFS-Web on the date shown below:

September 18, 2008  
Date

/Noemi Tovar/  
Noemi Tovar